

expanding said laser beam in a first direction to form an expanded laser beam;

removing a peripheral portion of said expanded laser beam through a mask to form a masked laser beam, said peripheral portion including at least edges of said expanded laser beam extending in said first direction;

condensing said masked laser beam in a second direction orthogonal to said first direction [in order] to form a [line-shaped] condensed laser beam [on an] at the object, said condensed laser beam being line-shaped; and

changing the relative location of said object with respect to said line-shaped laser beam so that said object is scanned with said line-shaped laser beam.

REMARKS

The above amendment with the following remarks is submitted to be fully responsive to the Office Action of October 3, 1994. For the reasons outlined below, it is requested that this amendment be entered and this application be allowed.

The Examiner objected to the title as not being descriptive. As a result, by this amendment, the title has been changed to "Method Of Producing Thin Film Patterns Using A Laser" to more accurately describe the presently claimed invention. Therefore, it is believed that this objection has been obviated.

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the present invention. Specifically, claims 1, 6, and 11 have been amended to properly refer to the laser and

the object previously mentioned in the claim as "the" laser and "the" object. The Examiner also believed that the claims were unclear for suggesting forming a beam on an object with a beam. As a result, claims 1, 6, and 11 have been amended to clarify that the condensed laser beam is line-shaped at the object. Applicant's representative believes that the amended language of claims 1, 6, and 11 accurately describes the present invention since the condensing of the masked laser beam does indeed form a condensed laser beam at the object which is line-shaped. Applicant's representative notes that the beam spot referred to by the Examiner, is simply and clearly the line-shaped beam at the object as presently referred to in amended claims 1, 6, and 11. Therefore, withdrawal of these rejections under §112 is in order and respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al. '358, alone or in view of Yamazaki et al. '855 and Toshiba KK or NEC Corp. '131 or '123 or Traskos et al. or Hongo et al. or Krimmel et al. By this amendment, claims 1, 6, and 11 have been amended to merely clarify the present invention. Moreover, Applicants wish to remove U.S. Patent No. 4,786,358 to Yamazaki et al. as a prior art reference by claiming priority to Japanese priority application 61-229252, filed September 26, 1986, prior to the August 7, 1987 U.S. filing date of the Yamazaki et al. '358 patent. The Examiner's attention is directed to the first paragraph, and the filing receipt, of the present application which establishes a chain of pendency back to U.S. application Serial No. 097,190 filed September 16, 1987 which claims priority to Japanese application 61-229252. In order to perfect priority, a certified English translation of Japanese priority application 61-229252 and an executed declaration indicating the related and priority applications are both presently being obtained and will be forwarded to the Examiner once such

*Priority
claim was
100-229252,663
9/26/86
by [unclear]
[unclear]*

is received from the Applicant.

With Yamazaki et al. '358 removed as a prior art reference, it is believed that the present rejections to claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103 are rendered moot and, therefore, have been overcome. Moreover, it is believed that the numerous other prior art references presently of record do not disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in amended claims 1, 11, and 16. Therefore, it is believed that independent claims 1, 11 and 16 are allowable and that dependent claims 2-10 and 12-15 are likewise allowable in that they depend from allowable base claims 1, 11, and 16. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejections under §103 is in order and respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner deems that any issue remains after considering this response, he is invited to call the undersigned to expedite the prosecution and work out any such issue by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,



Tim L. Brackett, Jr.
Reg. No. 36,092

SIXBEY, FRIEDMAN, LEEDOM
& FERGUSON, P.C.
2010 Corporate Ridge, Suite 600
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 790-9110

GJF/TLB/kb